

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 53, 61, 65, 74 and 80 are amended. Claims 1-11 and 15-85 are pending. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded along to issuance.

Statement of Substance of Interview Dated January 24th, 2007

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Robert Timblin for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's attorney, Daniel T. McGinnity, on January 24th, 2007.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney submitted differences between the cited references, Hu and Bush, and the claimed subject matter. In particular, the cited references lack at least "a management agent for each of the multiple data sources", and "calls for custom logic, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system" as recited for example in claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation or obviousness for the pending claims.

Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant's attorney proposed to amend each of the independent claims to further clarify claimed features. Applicant's attorney understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that the proposed amendments would overcome the outstanding rejections based on Hu in

1 combination with Bush. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments
would need to be presented in writing and that the search would need to be
updated.

Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended herein consistent
5 with the interview. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in
condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of
the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned
attorney to resolve the issues.

10 **Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-11, 15-20, 22-26, 28-48, 50-52, 54, 58, 60 62-64, 66, 68-79 and
81-84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Printed
Patent Application No. 2004/0158746 to Hu et al. (hereinafter "Hu"). Claims 21,
47-49, 53, 55-57, 59, 61, 65, 67 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
15 unpatentable over Hu in view of U.S. Printed Patent Application No.
2002/0083012 to Bush et al. (hereinafter "Bush"). Applicant respectfully
disagrees. However, to expedite allowance of the subject application, each
independent claim has been amended herein to clarify the claimed subject matter
in accordance with the interview, as noted above. Therefore, each of the
20 independent claims, as written, is believed to be allowable as well as their
respective dependent claims. For example:

1 **Claim 1** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold italics)
recites a method comprising:

- selecting multiple data sources connected to an identity integration system, wherein:
 - the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of the multiple data ***sources configured specifically for its respective data source*** to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source;
 - for at least some of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source is configured with credentials to perform password management; and
 - for at least one of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source calls for custom logic ***configured as code***, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system, to perform password management for the data source; and
- performing a password operation on a password associated with ***each of the selected multiple data sources***, wherein the password operation is performed using the identity integration system.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed, examples of which include at least: FIG. 4; p. 14 lines 13-23 (management agent); p. 9 lines 15-19 (custom logic); p. 16 lines 3-17 (password operations). Neither Hu, nor any of the other submitted references alone or in combination, disclose these features.

In making out the rejection, the Examiner relies upon Hu's disclosure of target computers 112, 114, 117 for "multiple data sources" and password storage 124, client module 118, and server module 108 for "includes a management agent for each of the multiple data source". *Office Action dated 11/14/06 p. 2*. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the

1 application, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the “identity integration
system includes a management agent for each of the multiple data sources
configured specifically for its respective data source”. In contrast, the password
storage 124, client module 118, and server module 108 relied upon in Hu are
5 commonly associated with target computers 112, 114, 117 as is clear from Hu,
FIG. 1. There is no basis in Hu for an individual management agent associated
with each of the target computers. Thus, Hu lacks at least the management agents
as recited in claim 1.

Further, in making out the rejection the examiner relies upon Hu’s
10 disclosure of “a user specifying particular target computers for log-in processing
and password access [0037]” for custom logic, from a custom logic source outside
the identity integration system” as recited in claim 1. *Office Action dated 11/14/06*
p. 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The user selections relied upon from Hu,
paragraph [0037] are not equivalent to the recited custom logic. Nevertheless, in
15 the interest of expediting allowance of the application, claim 1 has been amended
to clarify that “the data source calls for custom logic configured as code, from a
custom logic source outside the identity integration system”. Claim 1 as presently
recited clearly distinguishes from the user selections of Hu relied upon. Thus, Hu
lacks at least custom logic as recited in claim 1.

20 Further, in making out the rejection the examiner relies upon Hu page 4,
paragraph 0038 for “performing a password operation on a password associated
with at least one of the selected multiple data sources” as previously recited in

claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Hu in the portion relied upon describes a login technique and not “performing a password operation on a password” as the following excerpted portion makes clear:

Whenever the user attempts to access any particular target computer, step 204, the client-side password management module 118 monitors these network addresses, step 206. The URL's accessed by the user are compared to the URL list stored in database 120. In step 208, the client-side password management module 118 determines whether the accessed URL corresponds to a listed target computer. If so, the server-side password management module 108 is activated in step 210. The server-side password management module 108 retrieves the log-in script for the target computer and the user ID and password information for the user, from database 120, step 212. The client-side password management module 118 then downloads the log-in script and user ID and password information, step 214. The user client computer 102 then executes the script to log into the target web site, step 216. *Hu, paragraph [0038].*

Thus, the above portion describes a login process for a particular target computer which retrieves data for the login from a centralized database 120 in the system. Further the process is described as performed by a client computer to log into a target website, e.g., login to an individual or single site. While, Hu is directed to centralized login in which passwords may be involved, Hu does not in paragraph [0038] or elsewhere describes “performing a password operation on a password” as in claim 1. Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that “performing a password operation on a password associated with each of the selected multiple data sources, wherein the password operation is performed using the identity

1 integration system.” Thus, in contrast to Hu, claim 1 as presently recited describes
a password operation performed on multiple selected data sources. Hu, however,
is directed at login techniques with respect to particular target computers. In other
words, the login transaction occurs for a specific target computer and not for
5 multiple selected data sources. Thus, Hu lacks at least the password operations as
recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited
references. Accordingly withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11 and 15-52 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1
10 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are
also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those
recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record,
either singly or in combination with one another.

Each of the remaining independent claims 53, 61, 65, 74 and 80 have also
15 been amended to clarify, in varied terms and scope, the claimed subject matter
with respect to one or more of the features already discussed with respect to claim
1. Rather, than repeat the arguments made with respect to claim 1, it is asserted
that one or more of those arguments are also applicable to each of claims 53, 61,
65, 74 and 80 as amended. Amendments to each of these claims and their
20 respective dependent claims are addressed below. For reasons which are
discussed with respect to claim 1 and below, claims 53-85 are allowable over the
cited references, singly or in combination with one another.

1 In reference to §103 rejections of claims 21, 47-49, 53, 55-57, 59, 61, 65,
67 and 80 based upon Hu in view of Bush, Bush does not correct the above noted
defects in Hu. Bush is not relied upon for the features of claim 1 in the foregoing
discussion. For instance, Bush does not disclose, teach, or suggest the previously
5 discussed management agents, custom logic, or password operations as recited in
claim 1. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Hu and Bush as applied to
claims 21, 47-49, 53, 55-57, 59, 61, 65, 67 and 80 fails to correct the noted defects
in Hu. Thus, claims 21, 47-49, 53, 55-57, 59, 61, 65, 67 and 80 are allowable
over Hu in view of Bush for at least the reasons previously discussed.

10 **Claim 53** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold italics)
recites a web application for password management, comprising:

- a user identifier to find user identity information in an identity integration system, wherein:
 - the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of multiple data sources to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source; and
 - for at least one of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source calls for custom logic ***configured as code***, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system, to perform password management for the data source;
- identity information query logic to search information in the identity integration system for accounts associated with the user;
- an account lister to display the accounts associated with the user;
- an account selector to designate at least some of the displayed accounts for password management;
- a password inputter to determine a new password; and
- a password manager to request an update of a password associated with ***each designated*** account to ***the new password***.

1 Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and
drawings as filed, examples of which include at least: FIG. 4; p. 14 lines 13-23
(management agent); p. 9 lines 15-19 (custom logic); p. 16 lines 3-17 (password
operations). Neither Hu, nor any of the other submitted references alone or in
5 combination, disclose these features. For instance, Hu does not disclose at least
“custom logic configured as code, from a custom logic source outside the identity
integration system” and “request an update of a password associated with each
designated account to the new password” as recited in claim 53. Accordingly
withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

10 **Claims 54-60** depend either directly or indirectly from claim 53 and are
allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also
allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited
in claim 53, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either
singly or in combination with one another.

15 **Claim 61** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold italics)
recites an interface for coupling an identity integration system with a password
management web application, comprising:

- logic for communicating with the identity integration system, wherein:
 - the identity integration system is capable of updating a password on
multiple data sources that use various functions of password
updating;
 - the identity integration system includes a management agent for each
20 of the multiple data sources to manage data communication between
the identity integration system and each respective data source;

- for at least some of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source is configured with credentials to perform password management; and
 - for at least one of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source calls for custom logic *configured as code*, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system, to perform password management for the data source;
- logic for communicating with the password management web application;
 - logic for searching for objects in the identity integration system; and
 - logic for checking a connection status between the identity integration system and a data source.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed, examples of which include at least: FIG. 4; p. 14 lines 13-23 (management agent); p. 9 lines 15-19 (custom logic); p. 16 lines 3-17 (password operations). Neither Hu, nor any of the other submitted references alone or in combination, disclose these features. For instance, Hu does not disclose at least “custom logic configured as code, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system” as recited in claim 61. Accordingly withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 62-64 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 61 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 61, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 65 as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold italics) recites a password management system, comprising:

- a identity integration system having a metaverse space for persisting integrated identity information regarding accounts associated with a user and a connector space for persisting information representing multiple data sources connectable to the identity integration system, the accounts ***each corresponding to one of the multiple data sources and having*** associated manageable passwords;
- for at least one of the multiple data sources, a management agent for the data source ***configured to call for custom code***, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system, to perform password management for the data source;
- a web application for producing a list of the accounts from the identity integration system, for allowing selection of at least some of the accounts, for inputting a password, and for requesting the identity integration system to update passwords on ***each of*** the accounts based on the input password; and
- an interface to communicatively couple the identity integration system with the web application.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed, examples of which include at least: FIG. 4; p. 14 lines 13-23 (management agent); p. 9 lines 15-19 (custom logic); p. 16 lines 3-17 (password operations). Neither Hu, nor any of the other submitted references alone or in combination, disclose these features. For instance, Hu does not disclose at least “a management agent . . . configured to call for custom code, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system” and “update passwords on each of the accounts based on the input password” as recited in claim 65. Accordingly withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 66-73 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 65 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited

in claim 65, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 74 as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold italics) recites a management agent for an identity integration system, comprising:

- logic for adapting a connection for data communication, wherein the connection couples an identity integration system using a first data communication format with a connected data source using a second data communication format;
- custom logic ***configured as code***, from a custom logic source outside of the identity integration system, to perform password management for the data source; and
- logic for requesting a connected data source to perform a password operation.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed, examples of which include at least: FIG. 4; p. 14 lines 13-23 (management agent); p. 9 lines 15-19 (custom logic); p. 16 lines 3-17 (password operations). Neither Hu, nor any of the other submitted references alone or in combination, disclose these features. For instance, Hu does not disclose at least “custom logic configured as code, from a custom logic source outside of the identity integration system, to perform password management for the data source” as recited in claim 74. Accordingly withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 75-79 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 74 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited

1 in claim 74, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either
singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 80 as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold italics)
recites a computer system having a graphical user interface including a display and
5 a user interface selection device, a method of providing and selecting from a menu
on the display comprising the steps of:

- retrieving a list of user accounts from an identity integration system having persisted identity information regarding the user accounts wherein, the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of multiple data sources *configured specifically for its respective data source* to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source;
- 10 • showing the list of user accounts on the display;
- allowing each account in the list to be selected using the user interface selection device;
- allowing input of a new password via the user interface selection device; and
- allowing input of a request to update old passwords associated with *each of* the selected accounts to the new password *input via the user interface*.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and
15 drawings as filed, examples of which include at least: FIG. 4; p. 14 lines 13-23 (management agent); p. 9 lines 15-19 (custom logic); p. 16 lines 3-17 (password operations). Neither Hu, nor any of the other submitted references alone or in combination, disclose these features. For instance, Hu does not disclose at least “a management agent for each of multiple data sources configured specifically for its
20 respective data source to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source”, “allowing input of a new password via the user interface selection device; and allowing input of a request to

1 update old passwords associated with each of the selected accounts to the new
password input via the user interface” as recited in claim 80. Accordingly
withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 81-85 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 80 and are
allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also
allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited
in claim 80, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either
singly or in combination with one another.

10 Conclusion

The Application is in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully
requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue
remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is
requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/9/07

By: /Daniel T. McGinnity, #55,444/

Daniel T. McGinnity
Reg. No. 55,444
(509)755-7257